

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendment and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application, Claims 17-30 being withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 16 are amended by the present amendment. Support for claim amendments is found in the Specification as originally filed at least at page 19, line 19 to page 20, line 6, page 20, line 23 to page 22, line 7, and Fig. 1. The Specification is amended to correct informalities. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,660, hereinafter "Yanagawa '660") in view of Yanagawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,310, hereinafter "Yanagawa '310") and further in view of Matsuoka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,267,226, hereinafter "Matsuoka"); Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Yanagawa '310 and further in view of Matsuoka, and further in view of Kanno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,163, hereinafter "Kanno"); Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Yanagawa '310, further in view of Matsuoka, further in view of Szerlip (U.S. Patent No. 4,571,716, hereinafter "Szerlip"), and further in view of Roh (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,633, hereinafter "Roh"); Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Yanagawa '310, further in view of Matsuoka, and further in view of Szerlip; Claims 8, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka; Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka, and further in view of Inoue (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,991, hereinafter "Inoue"); Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka, further in view of Inoue, and further in view of Kanno; Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka, further in view of Szerlip, and further in view of Roh; Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka, and further in view of Szerlip; Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Inoue, and further in view of Matsuoka.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Yanagawa '310, and further in view of Matsuoka with respect to amended Claim 1, amended Claim 1 recites, in part:

An optical disc device ... comprising:

...

correcting means for suppressing changes in signal level of the light detection result caused upon boosting of the laser power of said laser beam and for subtracting information from said return light portion corresponding to said preceding sub-beam spot, said information being a portion of said return light corresponding to said main beam spot.

Independent Claims 8 and 16 recite similar features.

Besides the admitted deficiencies of Yanagawa '660, Yanagawa '310, and Matsuoka as stated in the outstanding Office Action, Yanagawa '660, Yanagawa '310, and Matsuoka do not alone or in combination teach or suggest correcting means for ... subtracting information from said return light portion corresponding to said preceding sub-beam spot, said information being a portion of said return light corresponding to said main beam spot.

An example embodiment covered by the claimed subject matter is show in Figure 1. Figure 1 shows an example embodiment of a correcting means for subtracting information of said return light portion corresponding to said preceding sub-beam spot (21, E and F of SP1 being fed into the adder 21), an example of information being a portion of said return light

corresponding to the main beam spot (22, $K \cdot WB$ ¹ shown going into subtractor 22).

Yanagawa '660 describes a device for controlling the power of a recording optical beam in an information apparatus which uses the recording power adjusting signal S_{CA} ² which is comprised of information obtained from the preceding sub-beam and the following sub-beam.³ Therefore, Yanagawa '660 does not use information obtained from the preceding sub-beam and the main beam spot for its adjusting signal. Yanagawa '310 describes a pickup for an optical system that locates sub-beams at positions rearward with respect to a scanning direction of the main beam.⁴ Yanagawa '310 uses these rearward sub-beams to form the signal SUBRF to correct for the change in level of the main laser beam.⁵ Therefore, Yanagawa '310 does not use information obtained from the preceding sub-beam and the main beam spot for an adjusting signal. Matsuoka describes a recording apparatus that reciprocates functionality according to direction in order to decrease recording time.⁶ Matsuoka does not mention correcting for errors caused by the boosting of the laser beam. Therefore, Matsuoka does not use information obtained from the preceding sub-beam and the main beam spot for an adjusting signal.

Yanagawa '660, Yanagawa '310, and Matsuoka do not alone or in combination teach or suggest correcting means for ... subtracting information from said return light portion corresponding to said preceding sub-beam spot, said information being a portion of said return light corresponding to said main beam spot.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 patentably

¹ Specification, page 19, line 19 : $WB = (A+D) - (B+C)$.

² Yanagawa1, col. 4, lines 17-26.

³ Yanagawa1, col. 9, lines 28-44 and Figure 6.

⁴ Yanagawa2, Abstract and Title.

⁵ Yanagawa2, col. 6, lines 28-40 and Fig. 5 and Fig. 8a.

distinguish over the applied combination of Yanagawa '660, Yanagawa '310, and Matsuoka. It is therefore respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2, 5, and 7, which depend from Claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagawa '660, Yanagawa '310, and Matsuoka and further in view of Kanno, Szerlip and Roh, and Szerlip, respectively, for the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable therefore also rendering its dependent claims allowable. Further it is respectfully submitted that Kanno, Szerlip, and Roh, alone or in combination fail to cure the deficiencies identified above. Accordingly, the outstanding rejection of Claims 2, 5, and 7 is also respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 2, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Matsuoka for the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable therefore rendering its alternately claimed subject matter as recited in Claim 8 also allowable. Claims 11, 12, and 14 depend from Claim 8. Accordingly, the outstanding rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, and 14 is also respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 9, 10, 13, and 15, which depend from Claim 8, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 and Matsuoka and further in view of Inoue, Inoue and Kanno, and Roh, Szerlip and Roh, and Szerlip respectively, for the reasons discussed above, Claim 8 is believed to be allowable therefore also rendering its dependent claims allowable. Further it is respectfully submitted that Inoue, Inoue and Kanno, and Roh, Szerlip and Roh, and Szerlip alone or in combination fail to cure

⁶ Matsuoka, col. 3, lines 19-63.

the deficiencies identified above. Accordingly, the outstanding rejection of Claims 9, 10, 13, and 15 is also respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 9, 10, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagawa '660 in view of Inoue, and further in view of Matsuoka for the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable therefore rendering its alternately claimed subject matter as recited in Claim 16 also allowable. Accordingly, the outstanding rejection of Claim 16 is also respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL:SAM:MMS\la

Scott A. McKeown

Registration No. 42,866